

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 5, 2008, claims 2-9 and 19 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 2-9 of co-pending Application No. 10/056,096. In addition, claims 2-4 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,114,996 (“Nghiem”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,190 (“Murch et al.”). Furthermore, claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nghiem and Murch et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,367 (“Engblom et al.”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claim 19 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. Support for this claim amendment can be found at least in Fig. 5 and lines 1-2 on page 5 of the current application. Applicants have also added new claims 20 and 21. Support for these new claims can be found at least in Figs. 5 and 11 of the current application. As amended, the independent claim 19 is not obvious in view of the cited references Nghiem and Murch et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 19, as well as the dependent claims 2-9, 20 and 21, be allowed.

With respect to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections of claims 2-9 and 19, Applicants note herein that these rejections will be addressed at a later time, assuming that these rejections are still applicable.

### I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claim 19

As amended, the independent claim 19 includes the limitations of “*the conducting plate being connected to a support that is at least partially located between the conducting plate and the ground conductor, the support being electrically insulated from the ground conductor,*” which are not disclosed in the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended

independent claim 19 is not obvious in view of cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al., and request that the amended independent claim 19 be allowed.

In the Office Action, the reference of Murch et al. was cited for teaching “that  
5 the antenna feed is capacitively coupled to the ground conductor by means of a  
completed flated conducting plate separate (figure 2 and item 9) from and opposed to  
a portion of the ground conductor (see figure 2, item 6, see column 3 and lines 15-  
48).” The element 9 in Fig. 2 of Murch et al. is referred to as “a third conductor  
plate,” which is located at one of the ends of a first conductor plate 5 via a second  
10 conductor 8, as described in column 3, lines 18-25. Thus, the third conductor plate 9  
is connected to the second conductor 8, which provides support for the third  
conductor plate. However, as shown in Fig. 2, the second conductor 8 is not at least  
partially located between the third conductor plate 9 and a second plate 6, which is a  
ground plate. Thus, the cited reference of Murch et al. does not disclose the claimed  
15 limitation of “*the conducting plate being connected to a support that is at least  
partially located between the conducting plate and the ground conductor.*”  
Furthermore, as described in column 3, lines 16-17, of Murch et al., the first  
conductor plate 5 is connected to the second plate 6 by a conductor 7, which means  
that the second conductor 8 is also connected to the second plate 6. Thus, the cited  
20 reference of Murch et al. also does not disclose the claimed limitation of “*the support  
being electrically insulated from the ground conductor.*”

Consequently, the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. even when  
combined do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the amended independent  
25 claim 19. Therefore, the amended independent claim 19 is not obvious in view of the  
cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request  
that the amended independent claim 19 be allowed.

## II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-9, 20 and 21

30

Each of the dependent claims 2-9, 20 and 21 depends on the amended  
independent claim 19. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of  
the amended independent claim 19. Therefore, Applicants submit that these

dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 19.

As an example, the dependent claim 20 recites “*wherein the conducting plate is positioned relative to the ground conductor such that a major surface of the ground conductor is perpendicular to a major surface of the conducting plate,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Murch et al. Consequently, the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. even when combined do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the dependent claim 20. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the dependent claim 20 be allowed.

As another example, the dependent claim 21 recites “*wherein the ground conductor includes a slot that extends along the length of the ground conductor and is perpendicular to the major surface of the conducting plate,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Engblom et al. Consequently, the cited references of Nghiem, Murch et al. and Engblom et al. even when combined do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the dependent claim 21. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the dependent claim 21 be allowed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Boyle et al.

Date: June 5, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300